

REMARKS

Claims 26 through 28 were rejected as anticipated by Streckfus patent 3,985,049. It is submitted that the Streckfus tool cuts a helix into rubber covered rolls for use in polishing a stainless steel strip (see abstract). There does not appear to be any suggestion of using the roll to contact a tacky adhesive on a linerless roll, as stated by the Examiner. Moreover, there does not appear to be "a stripper with a tip portion to cut at least one circumferential groove in the outer surface of the platen roll and to facilitate stripping the web from the roll "as recited in claim 26. Streckfus is also deficient with respect to claims 27 and 28. For example, with respect to claim 27, there is no teaching in Streckfus of "a web stripper having at least one tip portion extending into one of the grooves to facilitate stripping the web from the roll. The stripper defined in claim 28 is not even remotely suggested by Streckfus. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.


Claims 1 through 4, 8 through 13, 15 through 17 and 20 were rejected over Gomi (JP 1258970A) in view of Kusters patent 3,894,453. The abstract provided by the USPTO does not say anything about an "adhesive resistant platen roll" so the rejection lacks basis in fact. There is no suggestion in either Gomi or Kusters that the grooves can be used for stripping a web from the platen roll and, moreover, there is no suggestion of using a stripper in the grooves. The claimed combination is simply not taught. Grooves are formed in the circumference of the Kusters steel roller so that it may be used for the removal of water in a paper manufacturing process. Not only does Gomi fail to teach the claimed combination but Kusters would be of no use in modifying the Gomi roller. The use of Kusters shows that Gomi alone is an inadequate reference. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/821,212  
Amdt. dated October 5, 2005  
Reply to Office action of July 28, 2005

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected as being unpatentable over Gomi in view of Kusters and Huggins patent 6,347,897. It is not claimed that printer platen rolls having an adhesive-resistant outer surface is new per se. As indicated above, Gomi and Kusters do not teach the claimed combination and co-owned Huggins et al does nothing to assist in rejecting these claims.

Claim 29 has been amended to clarify the invention. Kunishima clearly does not teach a stripper as now defined. As the Examiner indicated "14" is a shelf, not a stripper. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph J. Glass  
Reg. No. 19,768  
Attorney of Record

Date: October 5, 2005  
Dayton, OH  
(937) 865-2012